Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/669,384	SUMI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Shefali D Patel	2621
All Participants: Status of Application:		
(1) <u>Shefali D Patel</u> .	(3)	
(2) Mr. Douglas W. Sprinkle (Reg. No. 27, 394).	(4)	
Date of Interview: 31 March 2005	Time: <u>3:00pm</u>	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: none		
Claims discussed: 1,5-9		
Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet		
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. 		
CHAVESH M. 4. HTA SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600		
DML 3/31/05		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)		

تر منه ۲

ď · · 3

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner contacted Mr. Sprinkle for minor error(s) in the claim(s). Please see the examiner's amendment for details. Mr. Sprinkle agreed to amend the claims 5-8 to overcome what would have been a 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection for having claimed "A recording medium" which is non-statutory. Mr. Sprinkle also agreed that "position/posture" in claims 1, 5, and 9 was claimed as it is discloed in the spcification, to mean "position AND posture."